

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-10 and 12-26 are pending in the present application. Claim 11 has been canceled and Claim 1 has been amended.

*1.) Rejection of Claims 1, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112:*

Claims 1, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. In response, Claim 1 has been amended and Claim 11 has been cancelled to overcome this rejection.

*2.) Rejection of Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103:*

Claims 1-8, 20, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Turner (US Patent 5,202,168) in view of Hakuta (US Patent Pub. 2003/0096904). Claims 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Turner in view of Hakuta in further view of Mimura (US Patent Pub. 2002/0191292). Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Turner in view of Hakuta in further view of Hubbs (US Patent 5,073,005).

**PLEASE NOTE:** The status of Claims 21-24 were not addressed in the text of the office action. However, the Office Action Summary page indicates that Claims 1-26 are rejected. Applicant notes that each of Claims 21-24 is separately independent. Therefore, no presumption can be made about the status of these claims with respect to a rejection for a parent claim. Consequently, Applicant will not make any attempt to answer any rejection based on conjecture and/or supposition. This lack of response by the Applicant is done respectfully and in good faith.

In the rejection of Claims 1-20, 25 and 26, the Examiner states that Turner discloses a target reflector where the object comprises "a diffuse material (as an adhesive) that is applied to the surface of the object that bonds with the surface of the object" (Col. 3, Lines 5-41). In response, the Applicant has amended the claims to expand the description of a diffuse material to include "where the diffuse material has a high index of refraction so that the diffuse material will reflect light from a light source across an array of angles". Support for this amendment is found in Paragraph 20 of the

specification which states “[A] diffuse material will reflect light from a light source across an array of angles. This allows an observer to view the reflected light at multiple angles from the source.” An example of the effects of a diffuse material is shown in Figure 5.

In contrast, neither Turner nor Hakuta teach, disclose or suggest a diffuse material with a high index of refraction so that light will be reflected across an array of angles. Consequently, the rejections fail for at least these reasons.

3.) Conclusion:

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, all outstanding rejections of the pending claims have been overcome. Consequently, a favorable action in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Please apply any additional fees or credits to Deposit Account #: 50-0954, Reference #: S7312-70443.

Respectfully Submitted,

<u>/davidmixon/</u>	<u>12/26/2006</u>
David E. Mixon	Date
Reg. No. 43,809	

Bradley Arant Rose & White LLP  
200 Clinton Ave. West, Suite 900  
Huntsville, AL 35801-4900

Telephone: (256) 517-5100  
Facsimile: (256) 517-5200